



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The Classical Weekly

VOL. XV, No. 21

MONDAY, APRIL 3, 1922

WHOLE No. 417

LATIN SALUTATORY¹

Vobis, collegae mei omnes, qui huc convenistis fortasse sicuti antiquitus Athenienses ad novam rem audiendam, nihil novi vel praeter expectationem adfero. Nos enim omnes antiquae fidei defendendae totam vividam vim animi dedicavimus, quare non necesse est neque ullo modo decet me vos adhortari ut magnos labores vestros fortiter atque audacter toleretis, quippe qui id ipsum assidue facit etis ac laudabiliter.

Duo autem proposita sunt vel praecepta quae summam attingere volo, non quod omnino nova sint vel inaudita, sed quod saepius negleguntur. Ac quo commodius disputationes meae explicantur, eas separatim exponam.

Primum igitur propositum hoc est. Nos, qui iuvenes in linguis litterisque et Graecorum et Romanorum erudire volumus, ipsi ea studia propter ignaviam nostram vel lenitudinem labi ac languescere sivimus. Plane enim apparet, immo vero proverbium est tritum ac celebratum, plures nostri saeculi utilitatem quasi veram deam colere venerique. Sed non tritum sit nisi verum. Nos autem, apud quos fides habetur in cultura animi atque in litteris humanioribus, nihilominus multorum imperitorum indoctorumque vociferationibus ac clamoribus perterriti, ita humiles facti sumus atque animo demissi ut fidem quae in nobis est perraro praedicare audeamus.

Propositum meum clarius fortasse illustrare possum si sermonem vobis renuntiem qui nuper inter me et medicum quendam habitus est. Filium quidem suum, cum ad linguae Latinae studium recolendum se recipere vellet, hic pater strenue vetuerat, quamobrem de hoc arbitrio ego cum patre disputavi.

"Nonne multi", inquam, "ad te veniunt ut sanentur?". "Multi", inquit. Et ego, "Aegri te visitant quia sunt aegroti nec sciunt quomodo ipsi se sanent?". "Certe". "Nec tu sinis ipsos aegrotos medicinam sibi praescribere quia opus sit?". "Minime", inquit, "nam prorsus ignari sunt medicinarum, qua ex ipsa causa ad me veniunt. Ego autem iam multos annos studio rationis disciplinaeque medicinarum penitus deditus sum, quare consilium meum auctoritatemque aegri petunt". "Atque eos", inquam, "stultos esse recte iudices, si se ad mercatorem vel advocatum vel magistrum sanandi causa recipiant?". "Maxime", inquit, "nam neque advocati nec magistri mercatoresve ullam habent vel disciplinam vel auctoritatem in arte medica, quare nullo modo deceat eos curationem medicinamque praescribere". "Nonne", inquam, "est medici officium aegrotis praescribere qua medicina quibusque regulis opus sit?". "Certe". "Atque magistri officium est discipulis praescribere quibus studiis

opus sit?". "Etiam". "Neque deceat magistrum vel advocatum medicinam aegrotis imperare?". "Non deceat". "Ac magister vel advocatus qui id conetur ardelio curiosior et stultissimus habeatur?". "Etiam". Et ego, "Tu quidem quatenus in pueris erudiendis vel in lingua Latina versatus es?". "Mehercule, non omnino". "Nullam igitur", inquam, "habes vel disciplinam in his artibus vel auctoritatem?". "Prorsus nullam". "Neque tu magister es?". "Absit omen!". "Agedum", inquam, "dic mihi tandem quonam iure tu, qui medicus es, audeas meam auctoritatem praeterire ac contemnere, cum filio tuo ad eum recte erudiendum linguae Latinae studium praescribam atque imperem? Nonne tu quoque ardelio maxime curiosus ac stultus?". Ille autem ridens nihilominus filium vetuit se studio linguae Latinae dare.

Tenetis certe quorsum haec pertineant quae loquor. Advocati quidem auctoritatem suam in legitimis et civilibus controversiis, sicuti in quaestionibus de medicina et sanitate medici suam, strenue defendere semper parati sunt, neque ullo modo tolerant si ignari se in alienis negotiis immisceant. Nos autem magistri, ubicumque imperita et ignara multitudo nos iurgio ac vi ridiculi adorti sunt, saepius per ignaviam nostram ex omnibus quibus stabamus locis perfidiose recessimus. "Vox populi vox dei", ut dicitur, quam autem sententiam necesse est nos quoque magistros sicut medicos vel advocatos parvi aestimare, quippe quibus auctoritas nostra disciplinaeque ac fides fortiter defendendae sint. Si enim nobis vere persuasum est studium linguae Latinae et hodie utilissimum esse et magni preti, oportet nos hanc fidem magna voce et validius praedicare, quorum vox sine dubio maiore iure audietur quam illa imperitae turbae.

Sed haec quidem hactenus. Aliud tandem propositum est quod fere nemo attigit, quod autem mihi minime praetermittere licet. Dixi supra de fide quae in nobis sita est. Sed apud quot nostrum est haec fides intelligens, consentanea rationi, probabilis, vel cuiusmodi ratio probabilis reddi possit? Hoc vos rogo, quia iam duodecim annos ipse magister linguae Latinae alios magistros eiusdem linguae innumerabiles id ipsum rogavi, quorum quidem paucissimi apposite atque ad persuadendum respondere potuerunt. Quid enim de advocati medicivae intelligentia iudicium censuramque faciatis, si ille de arte sua vel de exercitatione nullam rationem dare possit? Ac de magistri linguae Latinae sententia quam censuram faciatis si ille de disciplina sua atque arte nullam rationem dare possit? Prorsus mirum est atque admirabile quot magistri linguae litterarumque et Graecorum Romanorumque nullam fere rationem reddere possint quamobrem haec studia colenda sint. Primum igitur necesse est nos qui iuvenes in his studiis erudire conantur iustam atque idoneam rationem dare posse. Innumerabilia enim studia

¹This Salutatory was delivered at the meeting of The Classical Section of The New York State Teachers' Association, at Buffalo, November 22, 1921.

intentionem hodie studiumque discipulorum huius saeculi exigunt ac postulant, quare etiam magis necesse est nos magistros intellegere quibus de causis validis studium linguae Latinae inter haec multa necessario adnumerandum sit. Quamobrem oportet nos semper paratos esse ad rationem appositam exhibendam, si quis nos roget, 'Quare tandem contendis oportere iuvenes hodie studio linguae Latinae operam dare?'.

Sed finem faciam. Ex omnibus quae dixi benevolenter atque aequo animo patiamini me vos monere duobus esse opus praepositis: primum necesse est nos fidem habere validam in vi et virtute studi linguae litterarumque et Graecorum et Romanorum, ac deinde nos hanc fidem quae in nobis sita sit impavide atque intrepide ubique et cotidie praedicare ac palam sine metu efferre.

UNIVERSITY OF ROCHESTER

THEODORE A. MILLER

MR. BROWN'S "LATIN IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS"

(Concluded from page 160)

The table showing the rank in Latin in 1915-1916 of Freshmen who had entered College from the Schools investigated by Mr. Brown and the average rank in Latin of all Freshmen in the same Colleges is given by Mr. Brown to prove that the Schools of New Hampshire are doing at least as good work in Latin as those of the country as a whole. The figures are so small, however, that they prove nothing. Only 39 New Hampshire Freshmen are counted, and Dartmouth and Bates are the only institutions in which there were more than five of them. If the table proves anything, it proves that the Schools are not so inefficient in their handling of Latin as Mr. Brown's tests seem to indicate. The folly of inference from a small number of instances is well illustrated in the comment on the record of the Freshmen from one School, which sent three students to College in 1915. Two went to Amherst, where their average in Latin was about five per cent. below the general average; the third went to Bates, where his average was 15 per cent. above the general average, and 15 per cent. below the average of the six students from New Hampshire. Now, Mr. Brown's tests show this same School scoring in the fourth year above the average of the Schools using the Translation Method, in all of the five significant particulars. Yet the record of its three graduates in College is cited as a poor showing for the Grammatical Method.

Mr. Brown's animadversions on the effect of the study of Latin upon pupils' English are so violent and dogmatical, and he so palpably neglects essential factors as to make one feel that the whole investigation may be vitiated by an unscientific haste in reasoning or by antecedent bias. He maintains that "Latin as taught is a positive detriment to the learning of English", affirming, on what evidence of consentient opinion I cannot guess, that this fact is well known to Superintendents of Schools and Principals. But this is not all. He finds in his own test an abundance of

facts to prove that Latin does not, for most pupils, promote "logical thinking, power of exact statement, facility and precision in the use of English and similar abilities". It must be admitted that the evidence he presents does not prove the contrary, but that is another matter. It may be that nothing is proved, except that the test was not of such a sort or so set as to afford real evidence of any sort; or that the pupils whom he tested have not seriously studied Latin at all; or that the nature of our civilization and our educational practice unfit pupils to reason and write clearly. Even if Mr. Brown's test was a reasonable one, we still need to know whether the pupils he tested could have shown a higher ability in logic and in expression, if tested on similar material in some other subject. We need to know also whether pupils who had had no Latin could have shown a higher ability in some test equally adapted to both classes.

We are not told how long a time was allowed for the translation which Mr. Brown judges as English, and this, as I have already pointed out, is a most important consideration. The passage set was from Caesar's Civil War, 2.23-26, "with a few slight adaptations <and large omissions>", and was the same for all classes above the first. 21 Schools were tested, how many pupils we are not told. The vocabulary is open to the same criticism that I have made on the other test in connected Latin, with the addition that there are words all through the passage that even the second year pupil could not be expected to know. A good instance is *appellere*, 'to put in', which, moreover, is found in the same sentence with *appellare*. This *appellere* is the verb of a brief portion of the text, the mistranslation of which is held up as a horrible example. Another such portion contains *statio*, 'anchorage', and *eminentibus promunturiis*. You cannot ask even school-boys and school-girls to reason exactly and write correctly about things they do not understand. The last fourteen lines of the thirty-four of this Test formed the passage set by the College Entrance Examination Board in 1916 on the paper in Second Year Latin. The meaning of five words was given. The allowance of time was sufficient, and it is my recollection that the rendering was fairly satisfactory English idiom. 68.5 per cent. of the 2,115 books were given a rating of 60 or higher, 80.7 a rating of 50 or higher, 5.8 a rating from 90 to 100.

In one of the Schools in which the tests were given the average number of minutes per week devoted to the study of Latin throughout the four years was 240. In other words, pupils in this School were spending 576 hours on Latin in the four years—only 36 hours more than the boys at Exeter give to it in the first year alone. 240 minutes is the minimum for the Schools examined by Mr. Brown; the maximum is 790. The middle allotment in the lower half is 418 minutes, and in the upper half 565. Mr. Brown speaks of those Schools which devote an excessive amount of time to Latin, but does not indicate where the excess begins. Though better results are shown by the Schools which spend the greater amount of time on the subject, they are not enough better to satisfy